

Subject: Plans and Action for " Society for Cultural Contacts with  
Ukraine"

Source : as usual

Date : 11 Nov 1966

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCES METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B  
VAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2007

-A-

1. On 20 Sept 1966 from 11.30 to 13.30 hrs CHERNIAVSKY visited Dr Kl at her home and among other things discussed with her the "necessity" of establishing as soon as possible of a Society for cultural contacts with Ukraine. In his opinion the need for such an organization was at the present paramount because it was mandatory to have some "formal body" to negotiate with the representatives of Soviet Ukraine and to take care of contacts with Kiev. As long as Dr Kl and her friends remained just "private people" they will be hampered in their dealings with Kiev. They have to show who they are and what is their strength because there are many influential individuals in Kiev who contend that Kiev had no need to pay too much attention " to a few private persons" like Dr Kl and her friends.

Referring to their previous talks on Dr Kl's trip to Ukraine CHERNIAVSKY said that he was still of the opinion that Dr Kl should not have gone to Kiev with Dr LEVETSKY but he was now all for creation of the Society for contacts with Ukraine as this would help her tremendously in her negotiations with Kiev next year when, as he was sure, she will come there.

2. CHERNIAVSKY mentioned DRACH and PAVLYCHKO as one of those cases of which such a Society would take care. As long, however, as there was no such organization, he asked Dr Kl to help him in arranging a literary evening for both <sup>poets</sup> at the Round Table Club or at the Union of Writers "Slovo". In his view, the best way to arrange it would be to introduce them to people from the Round Table Club and Slovo at Dr Kl's house and then the former would agree with the representatives of both organization on data and program of the meeting with the public.

3. Dr Kl promised to help in contacting the Club and Slovo but she couldn't say anything definite moreover in view of recent developments

in the Ukraine ( arrests and trials of intellectuals). Dr Kl doubted the writers in exile would be willing to arrange anything for DRACH and PAVLYCHKO at the present but she will talk to someone from there. She stressed the fact how harmful those arrests and trials were for any development of cultural contacts, and for the same reason she saw no prospects for establishment of a Society for cultural contacts with Kiev, at the present.

- B -

1. On 12 Oct 1966 Dr Kl was visited by YAREMKO Ivan of Chicago , Ill. ( from 16.00 to 20.00 hrs). YAREMKO pressed very strongly on the necessity of organizing the Society for cultural contacts with Ukraine now and with no delays. He called it the Society of Friendship and its program described as a/ organizing of trips to Ukraine; b/inviting of Soviet Ukrainian delegations and artistic ensembles; c/ import of books, literature and other "cultural values" from Ukraine;

YAREMKO used more or less the same arguments as CHERNIAVSKY stressing even stronger than the latter that " a few private individuals are no partners for the government in Kiev and one has <sup>to have</sup> for that purpose at least some sort of organization". Furthermore, it was in the interest of those concerned with cultural contacts to have such a body to co-ordinate, control, and streamline the whole development of cultural exchange between Ukraine and emigration. Otherwise, Kiev will approach individually various private people and use them for cultural exchange. This would deprive Dr Kl and others of negotiating power and of control of what was going on between the Ukraine and the emigration.

Being realistic - YAREMKO suggested - one should also not press too hard on various points of demands on the part of emigration. Finally what were all these few people in comparison with Ukrainian government? - he asked. Also tactically it was better to put forward fewer demands

SECRET

and thus increase chances for their materialization.  
For that reason, for instance, one should not ~~press on~~ <sup>press on</sup> ~~any~~ religious desiderata at the present as there was ~~no~~ prospects for revival of Catholic Ukrainian Church in the West Ukraine, anyway.

2. YAREMKO said that he himself, Dr KL and STAKHIV Eugen should finally take initiative in their hands to create a Society of Friendship with Ukraine. They should also take advantage of BILOROSLOS' and others' presence in New York and enter with them into negotiations on the matter of the Society of Friendship. In Chicago, Ill. he was able to ascertain that more and more people are in favor of development of cultural contacts with Ukraine and now was the time to finalize and formalize this matter organizationally. One should pay no attention to attacks of Banderivtsi and melnykivtsi, the more they will attack the Society the better for it, This will only strengthen the position of the Society vis-a-vis Kiev and the Mission here.

3. Asked who would constitute the membership of the Society YAREMKO replied that first one should talk who should be eliminated from it a priori. Beside banderivtsi and melnykivtsi, the Prolog must be eliminated as well. It was absolutely mandatory to exclude the Prolog from all those affairs.

Asked why, YAREMKO replied, that no one in Kiev would talk with people from Prolog because Prolog is involved in a world-wide intelligence activity. Also their behaviour is such that only makes nervous Kiev. Take, for instance, Prolog's recent and latest announcements about the arrests and trials in the Ukraine. Why did they publish this stuff in their own name making it clear to everybody that they are the only one who got ~~this material~~. And obviously, they must have got them only through intelligence channels.

In YAREMKO'S opinion it would have been much better if someone else not Prolog, and preferably foreign press would <sup>have</sup> "vinilated" such informations. Otherwise the Prolog automatically closes all the gates

SECRET

SECRET

-4-

to proper channels in Kiev. And it is a pity, because Prolog has quite a few very intelligent people who could do a lot in this field.

4. When Dr Kl remarked that STAKHIV was also a Prolog man, YAREMKO thought STAKHIV could act independently and one should convince him to do so.

5. In YAREMKO's opinion the Society could not include such people as TOLOPKO or LEVYTSKYI but should not avoid any contacts with them either. On the contrary, it would be in the interest of the Society of Friendship to have common sessions and gatherings with "progressives".

In this manner the Society would eliminate any influence of progressives in Kiev and in the Mission in New York as well, and become the representative for all the contacts with Ukraine.

YAREMKO indicated that this was not only his own idea but <sup>also</sup> that of some people in the Mission, ~~and~~. On this occasion he tried to impress Dr Kl that he had quite a strong position with the Mission and Kiev and promised to tell them "to give ~~the~~ green light" for granting visa for SHMEIKO Vira.

6. Referring to the Prolog again YAREMKO said that of course not all the people in, and associated with, Prolog, are such that have to be a priori excluded from any contacts with Ukrainians from Kiev but he knew who was who in Prolog and as far as its hard core was concerned they were no good for the action he was planning.

7. YAREMKO complained that because of delaying tactics of Dr Kl he missed so many opportunities to finalize cultural exchange with Kiev and repented now that he did not go without her this year to Kiev.

SECRET

Anyway, now it's time to do something definite, moreover that he is being pressed by his personal matters as well. He is going to divorce his wife as they don't live together for longer than a year by now, and his wife has no understanding for Ukrainian affairs.

1. Late evening 19 Oct 1966 YAREMKO met with STAKHIV and Dr KL at the latter's home. He put forward again his suggestions but STAKHIV and Dr KL made it at once clear to him that "present arrangements through Dr KL" were quite sufficient and there <sup>was</sup> no need for anything else as long as Kiev was not ready for any concessions on its part.

2. On 20 Oct 1966 YAREMKO visited again Dr KL <sup>and</sup> complained about not using G.G. SHEVEL'S presence in New York to immediately enter into negotiations with the Mission on the future of cultural contacts with Kiev. SHEVEL, and not BILOKOLOS is the highest ranking official now at the Mission. He is a really big shot and he decides on everything. He also controls BILOKOLOS. His man here is KOCHUBEY who stands much higher than CHERNIAVSKY. YAREMKO knows all that for sure, moreover just last Tuesday (18 Oct 1966) he was to the party at the Mission and met there SHEVEL. The latter tried to get rid of Yaremko's question by jokes and generalities and behaved himself like a boss who couldn't care about anything. When YAREMKO asked SHEVEL why there were no Ukrainian films abroad, he replied because there <sup>were</sup> no good Ukrainian films at all. When YAREMKO complained about usage of Russian in Ukrainian Soviet offices on the highest levels, SHEVEL just laughed at him. But in YAREMKO'S opinion SHEVEL knows a lot about emigration and on him depended very much. Incidentally, together with YAREMKO there were at the party at the Mission also KOSACH Yuri, TOLOPKO E., SHUMELIKOS, and ~~also~~ PAVLYCHKO and DRACH.

3. Referring to HOLUBNYCHYI'S paper read at the Round Table Club on 19 Oct 1966, YAREMKO said that he agreed with HOLUBNYCHYI'S assertion that there were evidently two groups in Kiev whose "emigre lines" did not always see eye to eye with each other. Indeed, SMOLYCH'S

organization was more conservative and more inimical to emigres, whereas KOLOSSOVA was more progressive and genuinely interested ~~with~~ in contacts with other than communist emigres. KOLOSSOVA herself is convinced that emigration would <sup>be</sup> capable to help them in their efforts of Ukrainization in the Ukraine and is very keen on "moving things in proper direction".

YAREMKO mentioned again the "fact" that KOLOSSOVA must have known about his smuggling out of DZIUBA'S speech and saw him to the airport to avoid eventual search by customs officers. It was a pity that there had been no response to Kolossova's attempts to further develop the contacts she had started. In YEREMKO'S opinion, the emigres should have re-visited Kolossova in Kiev instead of putting forward "unrealistic demands" like those Dr Kl was suggesting.

In short, the emigres did not help KOLOSSOVA in her honest endeavors and hurt her badly. But now, since there are no prospects for implementation of plans for the Society of Friendship he would like to be at least in touch with what was going on in the field of cultural contacts in New York, N.Y.

4. Apart from the Society of Friendship, the New York Group should think about future trips to Ukraine, particularly of young people. The latter especially make a very positive and very strong impression on Soviet youth and one should take that into account. In his opinion this is one of the most effective instruments of Ukrainization.

5. Referring to DRACH and PAVLYCHKO, YAREMKO said that there was no point in talking with them about politics but for that purpose one should go to Kiev and speak with "politicians".

SECRET

-7-

-D-

1. On 10 Nov 1966 YAREMKO phoned Dr Kl telling her that he came to New York City and will take part at both, the cocktail party at the Mission and the literary evening at the Round Table Club, on 11 Nov 1966. He wants to see her, and "Society or no society (of Friendship)" he is already organizing a group to travel to Kiev on 20 June 1967. He also mentioned that in December 1966 Borys LEVYTSKYI of Munich, Germany is coming to New York and Chicago, Ill. and he is going to see him.

2. YAREMKO asked Dr Kl whether she knew a lady by the name POZYCHANIUK who was said to come lately from Ukraine and "who should be a very interesting person". She should be somewhere near New York. YAREMKO is leaving on Sunday with a Polish lady for Buffalo, N.Y. who will leave for Poland on Monday. He did not say what her name was.

*O. E. ... Pozychaniuk, Szanowna?*  
*12th ... Kloczko ...*  
*... ...*  
*...*

SECRET